

S.N. 10/647,373

Dkt. 501.43011X00
Page 14**REMARKS**

Reconsideration and allowance of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action dated May 20, 2005. Appreciation is expressed to the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 3, 7, 9, 13-18, 20, 22, 23, 28, 31, 32 and 34.

By the present Amendment, the title has been amended to be more clearly indicative of the present claimed invention. Accordingly, removal of the objection to the title is respectfully requested.

Also by the present Amendment, independent claim 13 has been amended to correct the grammatical informality noted in paragraph 2 on page 2 of the Office Action. Therefore, removal of this objection is also respectfully requested.

In addition, claims 8, 19 and 33 have been amended to change the term "almost equal" to the commonly accepted term "substantially equal." Accordingly, reconsideration and removal of the 35 USC §112, second paragraph, rejection set forth in paragraphs 5 and 6 of the Office Action is also respectfully requested.

In addition, claim 39 has been amended to revise the language thereof to clarify the question raised in paragraph 7 of the Office Action. Specifically, claim 39 has been amended in paragraph (b) that the first connection is formed on the first wiring. This can be read, solely for purposes of example, on the connection TH0a being formed on the first wiring M0a shown in Fig. 1. On the other hand, in paragraph (c), it is now defined that the second connection is formed on the first wiring and the projecting portion thereof. This can be read on the connection TH0d shown in Fig. 1 being formed both over the first wiring M0a and the projecting portion

S.N. 10/647,373

Dkt. 501.43011X00
Page 15

Nd (shown, for example, in Fig. 2 which illustrates the lowest wiring layer of Fig. 1.) As such, contrary to the indication set forth in the Office Action that the claim has been interpreted to mean that both the first and second connections are formed on the projecting portion of the first wiring, claim 39 has been amended to clarify that the claim is not limited to both the first and second connection being formed on the first wiring, but, instead, can cover a situation such as shown in Fig. 1 where only the second connection is formed on the projecting portion. Incidentally, it is noted that a cross-sectional view illustrating a connection covering the projecting portion can be seen in Fig. 7 which illustrates the connection TH0b covering the projecting portion Nb (noting that Fig. 7 is a cross-section of Fig. 8). As such, in light of this amendment to claim 39, reconsideration and removal of the 35 USC §112, second paragraph, rejection set forth in paragraph 7 of the Office Action is respectfully requested.

Reconsideration and removal of the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8, 10-12, 24-27, 29, 30, 33, and 35-39 as being anticipated by USP 5,014,104 to Ema is also respectfully requested. With regard to this, it is respectfully noted that each of the rejected independent claims 1, 2, 24, 25, 26, 27, 38 and 39 specifically defines the feature of the present invention that a projecting portion of a wiring is disposed under a connection. As discussed above, referring to Figs. 1 and 2, this corresponds to either the projecting portion Mb being formed under the connection TH0b or the projecting portion Nd being formed under the connection TH0b. As also noted above, a cross-sectional view of this formation of a projecting portion Nb under the

S.N. 10/647,373

Dkt. 501.43011X00
Page 16

connection TH0d is shown in Fig. 7, which represents a cross-sectional along the lines B - B' of Fig. 8 (noting that reference to specific figures in these remarks is solely for purpose of example). It is respectfully submitted that the reference to Ema fails to teach or suggest these limitations found in each of the rejected independent claims concerning the projecting portion of a wiring being disposed under a connection.

In the Office Action, it is stated that the arrangement regarding the relationship between the projecting portion of a wiring and a connection portion (for connecting the wiring to another wiring) is shown in Fig. 3(a) of Ema. For example, on page 4, line 4 et seq., it is stated:

"The first wiring (G1 or G2) and the second wiring (N11 or N21) are arranged such that the center of the connection is offset in the second direction from the center of the first wiring (G1 or G2) and a projecting portion of the first wiring (G1 or G2) is formed under the connection."

However, it is respectfully submitted that, although Ema does teach offsetting the connection between the first wiring (G1 or G2) and the second wiring (N11 or N21), the illustration in Fig. 3(a) shows that the projecting portion of the first wiring G1 or G2 is not formed under the connection itself (such as B1). Instead, although the projecting portion of the first wiring G1 and G2 is formed under the overlying second wires N11 and N21, respectively, it is quite clear that the connections between the first wirings G1 and G2 and the second wirings N11 and N21 do not extend over the projecting portions.

S.N. 10/647,373

Dkt. 501.43011X00
Page 17

With regard to the actual arrangements between the projecting portions Nb and Nd of the present invention and their overlying connections TH0b and TH0d, this is described, for example, on page 9, line 22 et seq., of the Substitute Specification which was filed with the Preliminary Amendment. As noted there:

"Further, a notch (a projecting portion or a wide portion) of the 0th layer wiring M0b is formed below the connection TH0b on the 0th layer wiring M0b (see Fig. 2). "

Page 9, line 24, et seq. goes on to state:

"That is, the connection TH0b is formed so as to be positioned on both 0th layer wiring and M0b and notch Nb and connected to the first layer wiring M1b."

This clearly corresponds to the arrangements shown in Figs. 1, 2, 7 and 8, as discussed above. This portion of the present Specification also serves to emphasize the difference between the present invention, in which the projecting portions or notches Nb and Nd are covered with the connections TH0b and TH0d and the Ema reference in which the projecting portions of the wirings G1 and G2 are not covered by the connection portions. Accordingly, in light of the above noted distinctions, reconsideration and allowance of each of the independent claims 1, 2, 24, 25, 26, 27, 38 and 39, and their respective dependent claims, is respectfully requested.

In addition, reconsideration and allowance of the newly submitted dependent claims 40-46 is also respectfully requested. By virtue of these dependent claims, each of the rejected independent claims 1, 2, 26, 27, 38, 24 and 39 has a respective dependent claim to further define an arrangement already set forth in the independent original claim 25. Specifically, claim 25 defines not only that the

S.N. 10/647,373

Dkt. 501.43011X00
Page 18

projecting portion is formed under a connection, but, further that the projecting portions of the first wiring are disposed only under the connection. In other words, as can be seen from Figs. 1, 2, 7 and 8, the projecting portions are substantially completely covered by the overlying connections. As such, this serves to even further define over the arrangement shown in Ema in which it appears that the projecting portion is not formed under the connections at all. With regard to this, since there appears to be no disclosure in Ema suggesting that the connections such as B1 overlap the projecting portions of the underlying wirings, it is respectfully submitted that it is not appropriate to interpret the possible slight overlap shown in Fig. 3a as anything other an example of the general nature of patent drawings. With regard to this, it is well accepted that "patent drawings are not working drawings", as indicated in the case of *In Re Wilson*, 136 USPQ 188 (CCPA, 1963) at page 192 and the case of *In Re Chitayat*, 160 USPQ 224 (CCPA, 1969) at page 226. And, clearly Fig. 3(a) of Ema completely fails to remotely suggest that the projecting portions are formed only under the connections. Therefore, reconsideration of these dependent claims 40-46 is also respectfully requested.

S.N. 10/647,373


Dkt. 501.43011X00

Page 19

To the extent necessary, applicant's petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in the fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 01-2135 (501.43011X00) and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP

By 
Gregory E. Montone
Reg. No. 28, 141

GEM/dks/ksh
N:\501\43011X00\AMD\CH9796.DOC